

From: ["Saric, James" </O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE:GROUP \(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT\)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=1563015DBEEE49A1AEA479C55929F0D1-JSARIC>](mailto:JSARIC@EXCHANGELABS.COM)
To: Jeff.Keiser@CH2M.com
CC:
Date: 4/1/2013 4:17:03 PM
Subject: Area 2 RI

Jeff,

I reviewed CH2MHILL's comments and MDEQ's comments. My thoughts are we should include MDEQ's general comments 4 and 12. What do you think? Are there any other MDEQ comments that you think we should include that aren't covered?

Also, I have two other comments for you to include along with your comments. Lets talk tomorrow maybe before or after our call with Paul about this.

GENERAL COMMENT

1. The RI report does not discuss the impacts on sediment distribution or channel morphology if the Otsego City dam was removed. Given the ongoing discussions regarding removal of the Otsego City dam between EPA, MDNR and MDEQ the possibility of the dam being removed exists. Therefore, although any remedy proposed in the Feasibility study needs be consistent with a "dam-out" scenario, the RI should discuss potential impacts of dam removal, sediment transport and bank erosion.

SPECIFIC COMMENT

1. Sect. 4.1, p.4-1: The Douglas trust indicates residential land use. How will this property as illustrated in Appendix A be used for open space/recreational in the future. This property may require institutional controls such as deed restriction in the future. This issue should be discussed with the Trustee as the FS is developed.